



MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 14, 2007
2:00 PM

ROOM 324A, RUG ROOM
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Steve Kinsey, Chair
Alice Fredericks, Town of Tiburon
Al Boro, City of San Rafael
Carole Dillon-Knutson, City of Novato
Joan Lundstrom, City of Larkspur
Peter Breen, Town of San Anselmo
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commissioner Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director
Bill Gamlen, Project Delivery Manager
Eric Schatmeier, Planning Manager
Li Zhang, Finance Manager
Denise Merleno, Recording Secretary

Chair Kinsey called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

1. Chair's Report

Chair Kinsey reported that he had nothing substantial to share with the group outside of agenda items. .

2. Commissioner Comments

None.

3. Executive Director's Report

ED Steinhauser began her report by noting that, for the upcoming Commissioner workshop, staff has begun structuring the agenda to include the kick off to the process that could lead to an update of TAM's 2003 vision document. The framework for this process would include interactive breakout sessions associated with either geographical areas or modes. Included in this discussion will be a couple of key elements unique ideas on how to manage transportation demand and a possible discussion about unique opportunities for transit, including transit-oriented development and what is on

the horizon. Bike/pedestrian activity is another topic that will be discussed. Staff will solicit ideas from its commissioners, the public and our advocates about additional paths TAM might take in the future. This would comprise the morning session.

Commissioner Lundstrom suggested including, in the framework, the demographics and economics of the county in the year 2020.

Commissioner Fredericks added to this idea and suggested including a forecast of the economic situation for the neighboring North and East Bay areas.

Commissioner McGlashan recommended an economic development specialist who may be able to assist TAM with this task.

Commissioner Boro suggested obtaining information about the commute pattern from Lake County.

Commissioner Breen suggested that representatives from Golden Gate Transit and SMART be invited as speakers. ED Steinhauser said that staff intended to invite them and MCTD as well.

Commissioner McGlashan suggested that the Green Belt Alliance, from the land use side, might prove helpful in terms of transit land use policy.

Chair Kinsey asked that all of these ideas be considered as topics for coverage but acknowledged that content may be limited in order to maintain a high level of quality and to meet the time constraints.

Karen Nygren suggested including Alex Hinds from the Community Development Agency since many of the issues that will be covered are connected to the county wide plan.

Chair Kinsey added that one of the big pieces of this workshop is to explore what TAM needs that it doesn't have currently and to think about new sources that TAM can tap into going forward. In the afternoon, he envisions the workshop would look at TAM's roles and responsibilities.

ED Steinhauser added that the segment dealing with TAM's roles and responsibilities is meant to provide a range of options for how TAM may want to treat its role in the future. Examples include an approach as simple as organizing grant proposals, countywide, and TAM's role in managing those processes or as elaborate as determining TAM's role when doing a joint agency document such as an updated Vision document. Staffing needs would be considered as well as how TAM works with individual cities and the county, as well as County Public Works, what they've done, traditionally, county wide. This discussion would take place after lunch perhaps touching on the ideas that stem from the morning meeting. She requested that this workshop be postponed from April 7 to May or June in order to effectively plan and execute the agenda items.

Chair Kinsey emphasized that the "kick off" to TAM's next visioning process should not be considered an expectation. Rather, he would like to focus on the current unmet needs, ie. traffic and congestion that is not being addressed by TAM's current efforts and what tools that might be tapped into in order to address these unmet needs. He added that it is important to understand what the cities and county believe are the unmet maintenance needs.

Commissioner Lundstrom agreed with Chair Kinsey's comment about unmet needs followed by prioritizing those needs. She said that these needs must be clarified before deciding on a process to solving them.

Chair Kinsey stated that he had two broader goals for this workshop: an opportunity to identify items that are not in the forefront on a day-to-day basis and to acknowledge and appreciate the Commissioners and the public who give of their time to deal with transportation issues. He suggested looking for a quality facility and a way of acknowledging appreciation for those involved. He recommended having a keynote speaker in the morning session or during the lunch hour.

Suggestions were made about who might be able to facilitate the workshop and about the venue which everyone agreed must be transit accessible.

While ED Steinhauser suggested postponing this workshop until June it was decided that the end of May should be the latest date considered due to vacations.

Chair Kinsey finalized this discussion by confirming with ED Steinhauser that she has resources available to her outside of staff to assist in the preparation of this workshop. She replied that there are, to an extent, but that attention to some current projects may need to be redirected towards organizing this event.

ED Steinhauser continued with her Executive Director's report by noting that TAM staff are intending to submit a candidate project to a recently issued \$64 million federal grant program called the Transportation Community System Preservation Program (TCSP). The funds must be obligated in this federal fiscal year, therefore by August/September 2007, and programs with advanced timing associated with them will not qualify. Staff is looking to recommend a grant for the Streets Smarts program which is an education piece regarding public awareness regarding safety around bike/pedestrian use. TAM has begun implementation of this program in two locales in the county but would like to implement it county wide since it's such a good safety tool. Simultaneously, the county is putting in for a grant to continue the Muir Woods shuttle grant in this same program. Staff has heard from the program advisor that this program may not receive many candidates due to the quick turnaround time associated with it. Staff's message to advisors on this grant is that it supports the shuttle over Street Smarts but if funding is available, it recommends both be awarded a grant.

The I-Bond was next on the report and ED Steinhauser noted that staff is very pleased with the programming by the California Transportation Commission of the funding for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows and the 580 to 101 connector. Staff is spending a lot of time, still, on shaping those projects as well as on MTC's program for assigning transit funds. TAM has joined other Congestion Management Agencies to seek funding from the I-Bond for a pool of transit-related projects. She also mentioned that the Petaluma Argus-Courier ran an article this morning about how our legislators may have not done the best job they could have in obtaining funding for the Marin/Sonoma Narrows because Segment B was not funded. TAM staff is preparing a response as are our local legislators.

Regarding the successful obtaining of funds for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows, TAM plans to address both the congestion relief element as well as the safety issues, such as interchanges and frontage roads that exist on the expressway and is coordinating with Sonoma County to accomplish this. She added that MTC will be approving the revised funding plan for both the Narrows and the 580/101 Connector improvements at its March meeting. The CTC requires TAM to resubmit the project proposals in early April.

Chair Kinsey clarified that the portion of the Marin/Sonoma Narrows approved for funding by the CTC is known as Segment A which is located in Central Novato. Staff is attempting to move a portion of those funds into Segment B, the area from Atherton Avenue to the Petaluma Bridge.

ED Steinhauser explained that the funding received was based on an old funding plan for Segment A. Funding was removed from other rural projects statewide, such as the Willits Bypass and a significant amount of that was given to the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project. Staff feels that it has an obligation to address congestion relief needs in the corridor while taking some of that money and addressing the safety issues in Segment B as well.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dillon-Knutson about whether the bike/ped portion of the project would be duplicating what the SMART bike/ped access is planning, ED Steinhauser responded that there was coordination with SMART before they developed their expenditure plan to avoid any duplication of efforts. Rather TAM's bike/ped portion would be a supplement to what SMART does elsewhere in the corridor. She added that what staff is proposing as the first phase of construction for this project is 100% "not throw away" meaning that none of the work that gets done will have to be undone at a later time.

In response to a question from Commissioner McGlashan whether TAM's STIP funding is still tied into the project as a match, ED Steinhauser responded in the affirmative and added that Sonoma's money is tied in as well.

In response to a question from Karen Nygren about how this discussion relates to the completion of the Environmental Impact Report due later this spring, ED Steinhauser that it will not impact the EIR and that the EIR will proceed as planned.

Chair Kinsey thanked ED Steinhauser for her report.

4. Approval of Minutes from February 14, 2007 Meeting

The minutes from February 14, 2007 meeting was approved without revision.

5. Adoption of Draft TAM Investment Policy (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced Mr. Jim Martling of Sperry Capital and Ms. Li Zhang, TAM's Finance Manager, who reported on the investment policy.

Ms. Zhang reported that TAM is continuing its relationship with the Marin County Treasurer who has been making all investment decisions for TAM. Staff is satisfied with the quality of service it has been receiving from the Treasurer's office and does not intend to change this relationship. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all investment decisions are made in TAM's best interests. In January 2006, staff brought a draft investment policy to the Board for review with the promise to revisit the policy once its financial advisor was on board. With Mr. Martling on board, staff met with Mr. Roy Givens, the county's Assistant Treasurer, who provided guidance on TAM's proposed investment policy. Staff proposes a policy that is consistent with the county's but also includes language that gives flexibility to request that the county make special purpose investments on behalf of TAM.

Mr. Martling told the committee that he has been providing consulting investment services to a number of local organizations in California since 1994 and added that he is impressed with the County's AAA-rating. He suggested that it might be appropriate for TAM to request a seat on the Treasury Oversight Committee for the Marin County pool. Then he proceeded to explain highlights of the policy ending with asking the committee if they had questions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dillon-Knutson as to what guarantee TAM has that it can withdraw its money from the pool, Mr. Martling said that TAM has an agreement with the Treasurer's office that it can withdraw its money after providing a ten-day notice that it plans to do so. Responding to Commissioner Dillon-Knutson's question about the county being able to use TAM's money if the county is short, Ms. Zhang said that TAM has its own account and total control over that account.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Lundstrom who asked if special purpose investments would be in TAM's name, Mr. Martling responded in the affirmative. She asked who the advisor would be in a special purpose investment, and Mr. Martling responded that TAM would ask the County Treasurer's office for suggestions on such an effort, with a likely possible strategy being a four- to five-year security.

In response to a question from Commissioner Boro as to the current rate of return for the county, Ms. Zhang noted that it is approximately five percent.

ED Steinhauser added that Mr. Martling was brought on as a financial consultant to assist TAM with its debt financing, a necessary step in that process being the development and adoption of the investment policy, which needs to be in place for any future debt structure.

The Executive Committee unanimously approved the Draft TAM Investment Policy and directed staff to bring it to the full TAM Board for approval.

6. Accept TAM FY 2005-06 Draft Financial Audit Report (Action)

Ms. Zhang referred the Committee to the audit report in the agenda packet as she reviewed it. She noted that the report is divided into four sections:

- The Auditor's Report: This letter indicates that all of TAM's financial statements are presented fairly and according to GAAP and that they did not discover any material errors with TAM's accounting system (no negative findings).
- Management's Discussion and Analysis: This section presents TAM's financial highlights and gives the public an overview of the financial statements. Currently, TAM is using the standard format proposed by the auditor but this section may be expanded for FY 06/07 in order to provide the public a more comprehensive financial picture.
- Financial Statements: Two changes were made from the last fiscal year. In FY04/05 year, there were only a few months of activity, so the auditor and TAM accounting staff decided that all activities would be audited as business-type activities concluding there was sufficient revenue to cover costs. However, in FY05/06, since TAM is a government agency, it became more appropriate to audit TAM as governmental-activities based. This makes the report more complicated but is more appropriate. There are two sets of financial statements: one is a governmental wide financial statement and the other is the fund financial statement. The other change that took place is that Measure A expenditures and revenues have been separated out

from other funding sources. Both of these added work elements created an additional contractual need of \$7000, an amount which was reviewed and supported by the Citizen's Oversight Committee. Notes To Financial Statements: This section provides explanations and the accounting basis used.

In response to a question from Commissioner Boro about whether or not there were any findings, Ms. Zhang said that there were none. She advised the group that R. J. Ricciardi has a background in governmental accounting.

Commissioner Lundstrom suggested that TAM consider changing the accounting firm it uses every five years or use a different accountant within the same firm. ED Steinhauser said that she would pass this suggestion along to the Citizens' Oversight Committee.

The Executive Committee unanimously approved the FY 2005-06 Draft Financial Audit Report and directed staff to bring it to the full TAM Board for approval.

7. Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program Report from Ad-Hoc Subcommittee (Discussion)

Commissioner Fredericks reported that this ad-hoc subcommittee has focused on finding a balance for the mandate to fund around the concept of the city corridor mobility shift while maintaining geographical equity. This committee suggests that there should be an emphasis on multi-use paths where all modes are served since there is an underrepresented pedestrian population. There was also discussion that this funding is dependent on showing a mode shift and yet 25% of the money is being used for planning activities. This sub-committee is not clear why that is occurring. Some of the projects haven't been vetted through the cities for their approval or acceptance. Finally, regarding the education programs that are being funded, the sub-committee feels there should be a shift of emphasis towards multi-use which is very efficient. One of the ways to achieve that is to expand the "share the road" concept towards the notion that everybody shares the road with everybody else rather than everybody shares the road with bicyclists.

Commissioner Lundstrom added that the need for geographic equity was stressed particularly in urbanized areas, transit, and connectors to schools. She added that a report will be prepared after this group meets again on Monday to look at what is being proposed.

Commissioner Breen noted that the Ross Valley community is upset and will be setting up a meeting between the elected officials, the town managers and, hopefully, Supervisors Brown and Kinsey regarding the inequitable proposed distribution. He believes that, in the interest to move this process along quickly, a clearly outlined process was lacking.

Commissioner Lundstrom added that during the public meetings, the focus was for either bikeways or sidewalks and not for multi-use pathways that everyone would use to link communities. Mr. Schatmeier noted that there were references made to separate bike and pedestrian paths by consultants' presentations during the workshops, but staff has corrected this and made it clear that they are considered as multi-use pathways.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fredericks about whether there will be an opportunity to vet a project after the allocation process, Chair Kinsey provided a scenario where a project has been approved at the board level and has moved on to the planning phase. He noted that the planning funds

are provided for the engineering and feasibility studies which would be the vetting process. There's no guarantee that the project would move forward.

Chair Kinsey finalized this item by noting that the creation of this ad-hoc committee has allowed the Board to look at the issues that, otherwise, may not have been brought to their attention. He added that there will be an opportunity for these issues to be raised at the next NTPP meeting. Further, he directed the sub-committee to present their concerns, specifically Ross Valley's concern about the process used, to Farhad Mansourian, Director of Public Works for Marin County, since Mr. Mansourian will be making recommendations based on the list provided by the NTPP advisory committee.

8. Selection of Safe Routes to Transit Candidates (Action)

ED Steinhauser reported that there has been "lukewarm" reception to TAM taking on the role of collecting candidates to submit to some of the recent grant programs, such as state, and federal Safe Routes to School grant programs and then seeking consensus for these candidates on a county-wide basis. Recently, TAM attended a meeting at MTC and was given guidance as to who would be the best candidates for the regional Safe Routes to Transit program, a \$20 million Regional Measure 2 toll-funded program being given out in \$4 million cycles. The first cycle yielded no money for Marin but the second cycle is underway. Three candidates have come forward for TAM to consider supporting. MTC considers support by TAM to be an important element in the candidate submittals. Staff discussed these three candidates with MTC who gave guidance on who the best candidates might be:

1. **Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Access Improvements:** MTC does not believe that this would be a strong candidate at this time since they have not yet adopted a document for what is likely to be the scope of this project. However, once a plan is adopted, they will look to Marin, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties to see what is feasible in terms of funding. TAM supports looking at external grant opportunities to help bring future funding for this project to the table. MTC staff have indicated that early phases of work, such as design of the project, will likely be funded by MTC.
2. **City of San Rafael – Mission to Hetherton Bike/Ped Facility Improvements:** This is a closure of the gap between the Lincoln/Puerto Suello Hill bike path and the Hetherton/Bettini Transit Center. The cost is estimated at approximately \$1 .2 million of which half the funding is being recommended by the Non-Motorized Transportation Program (NTPP) TAC and the other half is being recommended from this Safe Routes to Transit program. With this 50% match, MTC thinks that this is a strong candidate.
3. **City of Fairfax – Center Blvd. Transit Center improvements:** This candidate was submitted two years ago when the first cycle of funds was released. This project enables better bike/ped/ADA access in and out of the transit center. This project is not a solid candidate since this center doesn't carry many regional trips. This project might be well received as a secondary candidate, but MTC does not recommend this as a priority project over the Lincoln to Hetherton path.

Commissioner Lundstrom suggested that a letter of support for what the Board considers to be the best eligible candidate.

Chair Kinsey said that he does not believe it is a good idea for TAM to take on the role of becoming the collector of candidates for projects until the TAM Board takes a closer look at TAM's roles and

responsibilities. He added that a letter of support for a project would be as much of a role as TAM should assume at this time. He offered two possible courses of action for this cycle of funding: to remain silent since TAM does not have a process in place to notify the jurisdictions or to offer the opportunity for staff to review projects that any jurisdiction may want to submit.

ED Steinhauser responded by saying that the NTPP TAC asked TAM to submit this application and this is where the confusion surfaced. TAM staff has been told that the NTPP preferred that TAM not take on a direct role in projects, but since it was submitted last year by SMART in concert with the City of San Rafael, they wanted TAM to handle it this time. Mr. Schatmeier added that it is important to recognize that the NTPP reduced the funding from \$1.2 million to \$600,000 for this project in the NTPP program in anticipation of someone submitting an application.

In response to Commissioner Boro's request for clarification on a statement in the staff report that "TAM...received lukewarm reception from local government jurisdictions...", ED Steinhauser said that TAM staff has submitted candidates to state and federal Safe Routes to Schools programs, in conjunction with the local jurisdictions, and ran into concerns from some of the local governments that this was not a TAM role.

Commissioner Boro followed by saying that he believes that the reason the City of San Rafael is interested in doing this is because the bike path that TAM is sponsoring is going to create havoc as it comes over the hill down Mission to Hetherton. He added that he has no problem with TAM assisting in this project.

Chair Kinsey noted that this is a clear instance where clarified roles and responsibilities are important. He added that he wants to make sure that Marin County doesn't miss an opportunity to access this program. However, ideally, he'd like to see the City of San Rafael put in the application and if the project is successful, perhaps TAM could take on a role on the project delivery side. However, TAM's roles and responsibilities must be defined before that can happen. Regarding the Fairfax project, Chair Kinsey said that he believes that since MTC is a regional agency, they are likely to see the San Rafael project as more favorable. However, he recommended TAM staff contact Fairfax staff and advise them they may have a better chance if they choose a segment of their project rather than seek full funding.

Commissioner Breen suggested moving forward with a letter of support for the San Rafael project.

Commissioner McGlashan's said that, until clear roles are defined for TAM, he doesn't mind "muddying the waters" in order to give San Rafael the opportunity to submit a project for funding.

Commissioner Boro noted that this would not be an issue for San Rafael if TAM wasn't building this bike path, so it seems natural for TAM to be involved.

Chair Kinsey supports this project and as a commissioner can share with MTC the importance of this project. However, his concern is over the process of support and how other applicants might feel when one project is supported over another. He said that he would agree to agendize a letter of support for the March 22 Board meeting.

Chair Boro responded that the other project up for consideration does not comply with the regional effort necessary with this grant. He added that TAM's involvement will not affect whether the project is awarded.

Chair Kinsey suggested agendizing the issue of the Safe Routes to Transit Programs for the March 22 Board meeting, and directed staff to speak with Fairfax about the viability of their project, encourage San Rafael to submit their application making mutual aid available to them if needed. The full commission will decide which, if any, letters it wants to support.

The Executive Committee directed staff to agendize a letter of recommendation for all candidate projects to the Safe Routes to Transit Programs for the March 22 Board meeting.

9. Review of Draft TAM 2006 Annual Report (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser presented this item, referring to the report sent out in the packets, making additional copies available. She noted that the format for the Draft TAM 2006 Annual Report was approved by this Committee at a previous meeting. She also noted that a previously comment on a picture did not result in the appropriate change- the picture will be changed as requested.

Chair Kinsey opened this item to discussion.

Commissioner McGlashan thanked staff for including the mode icons he had requested. He requested that the 2006 revenue dollar amount be placed directly under the title in the pie chart section on the right side of the report.

Commissioner Lundstrom noted that the language in the section about the Greenbrae Corridor projects lends one to believe that the projects are fully funded. She requested that this be clarified.

Commissioner Breen referred to the letter from the Executive Director and suggested minor revisions. He also suggested that the Golden Gate Bridge District and SMART be included as partners in the ED letter.

Commissioner Fredericks suggested that the font size is too small and that black print is easier to read than blue print.

Chair Kinsey suggested enlarging the "Strategy" headings and that activities that are not strategy-related be placed in a heading such as "Other TAM Projects". He asked that the website address be bolded and that there be no differentiation between TAM and county staff.

Chair Kinsey announced that he needed to leave and was turning the meeting over to Vice-Chair Boro. Prior to doing so, he directed staff to agendize a legislative item for continued funding of the State Routes to School Program for the March 22 Board meeting. Further, he directed staff to consult with Shaw/Yoder for any additional items that require the Board's attention.

Chair Kinsey left the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

10. Measure A Strategy 4, Crossing Guard Program – Transit Incentive for All City Management Services Crossing Guards (Action)

ED Steinhauser asked that this item be continued to the April meeting.

11. Hwy. 101 Update

ED Steinhauser reported that Caltrans is considering closing the ramp at the I-580 connector for construction and it would be closed for 10 months. Staff is working with the City of San Rafael and Caltrans to resolve. After announcing this sudden new traffic switch, Caltrans has now assured staff that they won't act upon this without TAM and San Rafael's approval.

She also noted that the Puerto Suello portion of the Hwy. 101 project is being advertised on April 3. Bids open on May 30 and construction will start in June. On a related note, she said that staff may consider advertising some of TAM's smaller projects on its own in the future.

12. Open Time for Public Expression

Seeing no one wishing to speak, Vice-Chair Boro adjourned the TAM Executive Committee meeting at 4:30 p.m.